

Appl. No.: 10/540,812  
Reply to Office Action of: 08/06/2008

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-5 were allowed, as listed in the "Office Action Summary" page.

Claims 6, 7, 9-11, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kunishi et al. (US 5,306,168). Claims 8 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kunishi in view of Yokoyama et al. (US 6,347,950). The examiner is requested to reconsider these rejections.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). It is submitted that Kunishi fails to teach each and every element as set forth in claims 6 and 10 for at least the reasons described below.

Claim 6 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, "wherein the connector comprises a gap between the second stoppers and the fixing portion to allow movement therebetween". In contrast, Kunishi merely discloses a floating type electrical connector having a housing 4 comprising an inner movable housing portion 9 connected to an outer stationary housing portion 10 by resilient joint pieces 11, and a plurality of female terminals 5 disposed within the housing 4. The female terminals 5 comprise a base section 19 having laterally extending arms 31, 32, with projections 24 extending from the laterally extending arms 31, 32. The examiner asserted that the base arm 31 anticipates the feature "second stoppers". However, in

Appl. No.: 10/540,812  
Reply to Office Action of: 08/06/2008

Kunishi, "the opposite base arms 31 and 32 are fitted in the opposite recesses 33 and 34 of the stationary housing 10, and at the same time, the opposite projections 24 of the base section 19 are fitted in the opposite longitudinal holes 35" (see col. 4, lines 35 - 39, and Fig. 6). The projections 24 which extend from the laterally extending arms 31, 32 "skive into the stationary housing portion 10 at holes 35" (see col. 4, lines 1-2 and Fig. 6). As such, since the projections 24 are **embedded and locked** to the stationary housing portion 10, the base arms 31, 32 are **not movable** relative to the stationary housing portion 10. Therefore, as the base arms 31, 32 are not movable relative to the stationary housing portion 10, there is no gap between the base arms 31, 32 and the stationary housing portion 10 to allow movement therebetween.

Additionally, Kunishi discloses a floating connector which can only limit excess movement of the movable housing 20 towards the stationary housing 10. This is enabled by "permitting the bottom 27 of the moveable housing section 9 to abut against the rest sections 26" (col. 5, lines 28 - 30 of Kunishi). Kunishi does not disclose a connector having any movement limit structure or function, when the movable housing moves away from the stationary housing, as the case of applicant's claimed invention. Thus, Kunishi fails to teach or disclose "second stoppers adapted to move toward the fixing portion and come into contact with the fixing portion when the fixing portion is moved in a direction away from the opposing connector thereby stopping said protruding portion when the

Appl. No.: 10/540,812  
Reply to Office Action of: 08/06/2008

connector is removed from the opposing connector", as claimed in claim 6.

The examiner argues "that the recitation that an element is 'adapted to' perform a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform".

Applicant submits that the recitation of "wherein said contact portions comprise second stoppers adapted to move ..." provides a function limitation. The examiner is directed to MPEP §2173.05(g). A function limitation is an attempt to define something by what it does, rather than by what it is. There is nothing inherently wrong with defining some part of an invention in functional terms. A functional limitation must be evaluated and considered, just like any other limitation of the claim. MPEP §2173.05(g) further states that "[i]n a claim that was directed to a kit of component parts capable of being assembled, the Court held that limitations such as "members adapted to be positioned" ... serve to precisely define present structural attributes of interrelated component parts of the claimed assembly. In re Venezia, 530 F.2d 956, 189 USPQ 149 (CCPA 1976)." (emphasis added) Accordingly, the functional limitations recited in claim 6 must be considered and evaluated.

The examiner further states that "Kunishi teaches the second stoppers that are capable of moving toward the fixing portion when the fixing portion is moved in a direction away from the opposite connector, by directly pushing the stoppers". However, the extending arms 31, 32 in Kunishi are not adapted to move because they each comprise the projection 24. As

Appl. No.: 10/540,812  
Reply to Office Action of: 08/06/2008

described above, the projections 24 are embedded and locked to the stationary housing portion 10, and thus, the base arms 31, 32 are not movable when the stationary housing portion 10 is moved in any direction. There is no teaching in Kunishi that the laterally extending arms 31, 32 (or any other disclosed features) are movable relative to the housing portion 10 and come into contact with the housing portion 10 thereby stopping the movable portion of the housing 4 when the connector is removed from the opposing connector, let alone a gap between the extending arms 31, 32 and the housing portion 10 to allow movement therebetween, as claimed in amended claim 6. Accordingly, claim 6 is patentable over the art of record and should be allowed.

Though dependent claims 7-9 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 6. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

Claim 10 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, "wherein the connector comprises a gap between the second stoppers and the fixing portion to allow movement therebetween". Similar to the arguments above with respect to claim 6, the opposite base arms 31 and 32 in Kunishi are stationarily fitted in the opposite recesses 33 and 34 of the stationary housing 10 (with the projections 24 embedded and locked to the stationary housing portion 10). Therefore, Kunishi does not provide a gap between the base arms 31, 32 and sections of the stationary housing portion 10 to allow movement therebetween, as claimed in amended claim 10. As mentioned above for claim

Appl. No.: 10/540,812  
Reply to Office Action of: 08/06/2008

6, the functional limitations ("wherein the second stoppers are adapted to contact ...") recited in claim 10 also must be considered and evaluated. The features of claim 10 are not disclosed or suggested in the art of record. Therefore, claim 10 is patentable and should be allowed.

Though dependent claims 11-13 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 10. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge deposit account 50-1924 for any fee deficiency. Should any unresolved issue remain, the examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Appl. No.: 10/540,812  
Reply to Office Action of: 08/06/2008

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Juan Juan (Reg. No. 60,564)

11/06/2008  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Customer No.: 29683  
Harrington & Smith, PC  
4 Research Drive  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212  
203-925-9400

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

11/6/2008  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Clairine F. Mason  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Person Making Deposit